

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/963,373	Applicant(s) NAKAMURA, HIROAKI	
	Examiner Mark R. Milia	Art Unit 2625	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mark R. Milia. (3) Catherine M. Voisinet.
 (2) King Poon. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 07 December 2006.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 4, 6-9 and 13-20.

Identification of prior art discussed: Usami, Inoue.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed reference of Usami in regards to claim 1.

Examiner Agrees that Usami does not disclose comparing a reference image ^{with} that is different from a finished-state-predicting image. Upon a formal response the examiner will search the case again and reconsider. Applicant's Attorney discussed amending claim 19 to further define the difference between the reference image and the finished-state-predicted image.

Examiner Agrees to withdraw the current rejection upon a formal response.